

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20 were rejected. The claims were rejected under Section 103(a) over the combination of Huang and Multer.

In the rejection, the examiner acknowledged that Huang fails to disclose a formatter that formats a change entry in a change list to include a tag link indicator that indicates a change entry's link. But, the examiner relied upon Multer for showing such a formatter.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 15 have been further amended, as set forth herein in manners believed better to distinguish the invention of the present application over the cited combination of references.

Support for the additional amendments is found, e.g., on page 11, lines 1-11.

With respect to claim 1, the recitation of the formatter has further been amended to state that the formatter includes a tag length indicator, which indicates a length of a change entry in which the entry is free of a null terminator. Claim 15 has been analogously amended.

Particularly as now-amended, the applicants believe that Multer fails to disclose the formatter, or analogous operation, set forth now in the claims. And, accordingly, the rejection under section 103 is respectfully traversed.

Review of the cited portions of Multer indicate that tags are used to represent actual content objects (See, e.g., column 20, lines 62-64). Column 25, lines 41-52 indicate links of a field tag, a field type, and a field subtype, respectively. And, column 23, lines 20 and 28 indicate fixed, field-sizes of various fields of a header. None of these cited sections shows a tag length indicator which indicates a length of a change entry. Instead, the cited sections merely show that fields are of pre-ordained lengths. Change-list entries disclosed in the present invention, and recited in the claims, are not necessarily of pre-ordained lengths. And, the tag length indicator set forth now in claim 1 is stated to indicate a length of a change entry of the change list.

Additionally, the Applicants again traverse the Examiner's reliance upon Huang. The claims state that, after a synchronization session takes place, all changes that are subsequently made to a database, subsequent to a previously-conducted synchronization session, are contained in the change list. That is to say, the change list is stated to contain "... all changes made ... subsequent to a previously-conducted synchronization session." Huang fails to disclose such structure or operation. Specifically, Huang does not disclose the keeping of a log of all changes. Instead, Huang merely discloses the keeping of a log of only recent changes to a database. See generally, e.g., column 15, lines 18-32 of Huang. Line 24 of column 15 states, "that only the most recent relevant changes are kept." This disclosure is contrary to the structure and methodology of the claims, as now-recited.

Accordingly, no combination of Huang and Multer can be made to form the invention, as now-recited.

As the dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective parent claims, these claims are believed to be patenably distinguishable over the cited combination for the same reason as those given with respect to their parent claim.

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 15, and the dependent claims dependent thereon are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration for allowance is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly, Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com